REMARKS

Applicant appreciates the time taken by the Examiner to review Applicant's present application. This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Official Action mailed October 5, 2005. Claim 1 has been amended and Claims 2-20 have been added. No new matter is introduced herein. Support for the amendments presented herein can be found in the specification as originally filed, particularly in paragraphs [0025], [0037], [0040], [0043], [0052], [0060], [0062], [0072] and [0076].

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

On December 29, 2005, Agent Diana Schaffer held a telephone interview with Examiner Stephan F. Willett in regard to United States Patent Application No. 10/027,384 ("the '384 Application"). Applicants appreciate Examiner Willett's granting a telephone interview. In the Office Action dated 10/05/05, the prior art cited was United States Patent No. 6,744,452 ("McBrearty",) and United States Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0054087 ("Flom"). No additional prior art was discussed in the telephone interview. Agent Schaffer and Examiner Willett discussed Claim 1 during the telephone interview. Specifically, the Agent and the Examiner discussed proposed amendments to Claim 1 including the limitations, "if said template generates content that will be cached" and "caching said DGLSC in at least one server computer in a locale-sensitive directory." Agent Schaffer expressed that the cited art did not teach or suggest the limitations of Claim 1. Examiner Willet agreed that the aforementioned proposed amendment overcame the previous rejection to Claim 1. Examiner Willett further agreed to review added claims included with Applicant's next response in light of the interview.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 1 was rejected as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,744,452 ("McBrearty") in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0054087 ("Flom"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection as set forth in further detail below.

New Amended Claims

The claims as amended herein differ from the claims discussed in the December 29 interview. However, Applicants submit that these claims similarly overcome the Examiner's prior rejections.

Dynamically generating requested content from a template as a dynamically-generated locale-sensitive content ('DGLSC') based on user's locale preference

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, "dynamically generating [a] requested content ... based on [a] user's locale preference." *See*, the '384 Application, paragraph [0025]. Once a user's locale preferences are determined, they can be utilized by appropriate page generation engines for page generation processing. *See*, id. at paragraph [0043].

In contrast, McBrearty seems to be directed to a method for handling a user request from a cache. McBrearty appears to teach choosing between providing a user with a cached web page, or downloading the same (potentially updated) web page from its server. However, McBrearty does not appear to teach either dynamically generating locale-sensitive content in response to a user request, or generating the requested content based upon the user's locale preference. Similarly, the portions of Flom cited by the Examiner do not appear to remedy these deficiencies in McBrearty with respect to the claimed limitation of dynamically generating requested content from a template as a dynamically-generated locale-sensitive content ("DGLSC") based on user's locale preference.

If the template generates content that will be cached, generating a locale-sensitive filename for the DGLSC based the user's locale preference and associating the DGLSC with the locale-sensitive filename.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, "generating a locale-sensitive filename ... based on [the] user's locale preference and associating [the] DGLSC with [the] locale-sensitive filename." *See*, id. at paragraphs [0014] and [0025]. The locale-sensitive filename is generated for caching the DGLSC. The DGLSC is cached under the locale-sensitive filename in a locale-specific directory, as recited in Claim 10.

In contrast, McBrearty appears to be directed to a method for searching for a cached file in a user's browser cache directory if a cached file is to be used. However, McBrearty does not appear to reference user's locale or locale preference. Moreover, McBrearty does not appear to teach or suggest generating locale-sensitive filenames based on user locale preference or caching locale-sensitive content in a locale-specific directory. Similarly, the portions of Flom cited by the Examiner do not appear to remedy these deficiencies in McBrearty with respect to the claimed limitation of generating a locale-sensitive filename for the DGLSC based the user's

locale preference and associating the DGLSC with the locale-sensitive filename if the template generates content that will be cached.

<u>Caching said DGLSC in at least one server computer in a locale-sensitive directory to be served in response to subsequent requests having the same locale preference.</u>

Further, Claim 1 recites, *inter alia,* "caching [the] DGLSC in at least one server computer in a locale-sensitive directory to be served in response to subsequent requests having the same locale preference." *See,* id. at paragraph [0025]. The DGLSC can be cached in a locale-sensitive directory such that it can be served (and thus avoid duplicative generation of the same content) in response to subsequent requests from users having the same locale preference.

As McBrearty does not appear to address locales, McBrearty does not appear to teach caching content in a locale-sensitive directory to be served in response to subsequent requests having the same locale preference.

Flom was applied for the specific teaching of "location sensitive streaming" in "delivering a ... content package ... based on ... automatically based on geographic location," citing paragraph [0013], line 8-13 of Flom. The portions of Flom cited by the Examiner do not appear to teach or suggest that if a template is marked as cacheable, generating a locale-sensitive filename for the DGLSC based on the user's locale preference, as recited in Claim 1.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants submit that the alleged combination of McBrearty and Flom does not teach or suggest all of the claim limitations as set forth in independent Claim 1. Newly added Claims 2-20 are similarly submitted to be patentable over McBrearty in view of Flom. If the ground of rejections is to be maintained in the next Office Action, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner specifically point out in McBrearty as well as in Flom each and every claimed element as set forth in Claims 1-20, for instance: determining the user's locale preference with an automatic locale detection algorithm; dynamically generating the requested content from a template as a dynamically-generated locale-sensitive content ('DGLSC') based on the locale preference; if the template is marked as cacheable, generating a locale-sensitive filename for the DGLSC based on the locale preference and associating the DGLSC with the locale-sensitive filename; and caching the

DGLSC in at least one server computer in a locale-sensitive directory to be served in response to subsequent requests having the same locale preference.

Applicant has now made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. Other than as explicitly set forth above, this reply does not include an acquiescence to statements, assertions, assumptions, conclusions, or any combination thereof in the Office Action. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests full allowance of Claims 1-20. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number listed below for prompt action in the event any issues remain.

The Director of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-3183 of Sprinkle IP Law Group.

Respectfully submitted,

Sprinkle IP Law Group
Attorneys for Applicant

John Adair
Reg. No. 51,388

Date: January 5, 2006

1301 W. 25th Street, Suite 408
Austin, TX 78705
Tel. (512) 637-9220
Fax. (512) 371-9088